

Appl. No. : 10/699,589  
Filed : October 31, 2003

### REMARKS

Applicants would initially like to thank Examiner Gherbi for the Advisory Action mailed July 28, 2005. In response to the Advisory Action, as well as to the Office Action mailed June 6, 2005, Applicants have amended the present claims to place them into condition for allowance.

In particular, Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the recitations of dependent Claim 5. Dependent Claim 5 has been cancelled. Claims 1 through 4 and 6 through 23 are therefore believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 29 through 49 have been cancelled without prejudice, to facilitate allowance of the present application. Applicants may pursue these or similar claims in one or more continuing applications.

Claim 50 has been amended to include the limitations of dependent Claims 54, 55 and 56. Dependent Claims 54, 55 and 56 have been cancelled. As such, Claims 50 through 53 and 57 through 68 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

In paragraph 7 of the Advisory Action, the Examiner indicated that Claims 5 and 26 were objected to. However, Applicants believe that the reference to Claim 26 in this instance was a typographical error, and should instead have read 56. The basis for Applicants' belief is as follows.

Page 4 of the Office Action mailed June 6, 2005 recites as follows:

#### *Allowable Subject Matter*

7. Claim 5 and 56 are objected to as being dependant upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
8. Claims 24 through 28 are allowed.

On the Office Action Summary of the June 6, 2005 Office Action, however, paragraph 7 indicates that "Claims 5 and 26 is/are objected to." Claims 24 and 28 were indicated to be allowed.

Thus, it appears that the Office Action Summary erroneously recited Claim 26 instead of Claim 56 as being objected to. On Applicants' substantive review of the pending claims and other

Appl. No. : 10/699,589  
Filed : October 31, 2003

outstanding rejections, Applicants believe that Claim 56 is allowable, and in view of the allowance of Claim 26, the indication that Claim 26 is objected to appears to be an error.

Accordingly, Applicants have assumed herein that the true status of Claim 56 prior to entry of the foregoing amendments was "objected to" and that the objected status of Claim 26 referenced in the Advisory Action is a carry-forward of an error of typographical nature.

If Applicants' assumption is in error, the Examiner is cordially invited to telephone the undersigned, so that appropriate modification of the pending claims can be made by Examiner's Amendment.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that Claims 1 through 4, 6 through 28, 50 through 53 and 57 through 68 are in condition for allowance.

#### CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims of the present application are in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly solicited. If, however, any questions remain, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact the undersigned so that any such matter may be promptly resolved.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 9/7/05

By: Gerard von Hoffmann

Gerard von Hoffmann  
Registration No. 33,043  
Attorney of Record  
Customer No. 20,995  
(949) 760-0404

1912586  
090205